

during a period of migration of destitute persons from the Dust Bowl, the period of growth accounts in part for the preponderance of persons from that area. It seems likely that, despite the fact that other communities of like age have developed them, the influence of the automobile inhibited the growth of local social and economic services. At least it has made it possible for a community to function despite their absence.

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION FACTORS

The specific difference between Arvin and Dinuba with respect to farm production is that Dinuba is overwhelmingly a fruit—specifically grape—producing area, while Arvin is dominated by row crops, mostly cotton. Several measures of this difference have been presented. In terms of intensive land use Dinuba has nearly twice the proportion of orchard and vineyard (65 percent as against 36 percent) and only a fourth the proportion of row crops (11 percent as against 41 percent). In terms of value of production, Dinuba fruit is again twice as great as Arvin (69 percent compared to 36 percent), cotton is a third as great (7 percent compared to 20 percent), and all row crops a fifth (8 percent compared to 41 percent). Forage crops and livestock are, roughly, comparable in extent, while grain production is far more important in Arvin than in Dinuba. The financial importance of this class is minor, but the area of land use is greatest of any single class in Arvin.

Social poverty is frequently associated in American agriculture with cotton. The relation of the two in the South under the techniques and institutions which exist there is well established. It is, therefore, reasonable to assume a comparable relationship in California. Closer examination of the total production pattern shows great differences between cotton cultivation in the South and in the irrigated areas of the West. In the South it is associated with the sharecropper pattern of relationships, with the existence of a separate racial caste, with high degree both of farm specialization and area specialization, with long-term soil depletion, and with relatively low intensity of operations and comparably low yields. Institutionally, cotton production in the South is, therefore, quite different from cotton production in the West, so that it is improper to infer similar social conditions in the two areas from a single economic similarity. Since, however, impoverished social and economic conditions appear also to be associated with cotton in the West, it is necessary to examine the possibility further. The extent of such association is limited. Many of the communities offering the poorest facilities for social life are in cotton-producing areas. Tipton, Pixley, Buttonwillow, Firebaugh, and Mendota are all examples of cotton communities having relatively few business establishments and social facilities. They are also all associated with large-scale operations, and most of them, like Arvin, have had a relatively short existence. On the other hand, towns like Madera, Wasco, and Shafter offer far greater facilities than Arvin and are likewise associated with cotton culture to about the same extent.

The question therefore arises: Is the association between impoverished social milieu and cultivation of cotton a direct one, or does it result from the further association between cotton, on one hand, and, on the other, the existence of an economically destitute and socially